



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,847	04/12/2001	B.C. Hornady	HORNADY-2	2215

7590 04/28/2003

Bradley Arant Rose & White LLP
Suite 1400
2001 Park Place
Birmingham, AL 35203-2736

EXAMINER

GUTMAN, HILARY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3612

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/833,847

Applicant(s)

Hornady

Examiner

Hilary Gutman

Art Unit

3612

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Hilary Gutman

(3) _____

(2) John Smith T

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 21, 2003Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

JP '573 and Stewart '028 both of recordAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant discussed significant differences between JP '573 and the invention. Specifically, JP '573 does not disclose a retractable line "maneuvered in multiple directions". The examiner agrees that this feature is not shown. This limitation may overcome JP '573 if added to the claims. Also, the applicant argued that Stewart '028 discloses a means 96 for operating that IS "remote" (and separate) from the crane apparatus but stated that although the means 96 are positioned away from the crane, the controller 96 is also "connected" to the crane (Figure 1). Finally, the applicant argued that the rod or drum 25 of JP '573 is not rotatable as claimed. The abstract states "the sheet 21 is made to pass the periphery of the drum 25" but does not disclose the drum being rotatable. This distinction overcomes the reference. The examiner stated that additional searching and a translation of JP '573 might be required. The applicant agreed to submit an amendment with changes and arguments as discussed above.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

D. GLENN DAYOAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Hilary Gutman
HILARY GUTMAN
3612

4/21/03

Examiner's signature, if required